

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated January 25, 2007, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant wishes to thank Examiners Leslie Wong and Usmaan Saeed for granting an interview to Applicant's Representative, Daniel J. Swirsky, Reg. No. 45,148, and Inventor Yoav Ossia on April 25, 2007. During the discussion of claim 12 Applicant asserted that the recited step of tracing objects only if they are on unmarked cards was not obvious in view of the Printezis reference, particularly as Printezis shows marking of objects both on marked cards/pages (Figs. 1B and 1C, object 'g') and unmarked cards/pages (Fig. 1A), and thus Printezis offers no motivation to trace objects only if they are on unmarked cards. The elimination of step C) of claim 12 was then suggested, whereupon the Examiners indicated that claim 12 would distinguish over the cited prior art reference and overcome the rejection if step C) were eliminated.

Claim 20 was then discussed. The elimination of step C) from claim 20 was suggested in view of the discussion of claim 12, as steps A) – G) of both claims are identical. Applicant then asserted that Printezis offers no motivation to unmark cards during concurrent tracing/marketing and mutator operation if the marked card does not contain at least one marked object, as recited in step L), particularly as Printezis only unmarks cards after the mutator is suspended (i.e., not during the concurrent phase – see Fig. 1D), and does so without regard to whether or not a marked card contains a marked object. Inventor pointed out the specific benefits of having as few marked cards as possible. Applicant suggested changing the wording in step L) from “at any time relative to performing any of steps a) – g)” to “at any time while performing...”. The Examiners suggested changing the wording to “at any time while performing concurrently ...” which language Applicant accepted, whereupon the Examiners indicated that claim 20 would distinguish over the cited prior art reference and overcome the rejection if it were so amended.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 12 – 15, 20 – 23, 42, 44, 46, and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Printezis, et al. (hereinafter “Printezis”). Claims 12 and 20 are amended herewith as discussed above.

Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 13 – 15 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 12, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 13 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 21 – 23 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 20, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 21 – 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 42 sets forth the invention in claim 12 as a system, and is deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 12.

Claim 44 sets forth the invention in claim 20 as a system, and is deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 20.

Claim 46 has been amended to restate claim 12 in “Beauregard” format, and is deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 12.

Claim 48 has been amended to restate claim 20 in “Beauregard” format, and is deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 20.

Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 42, 44, 46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 10, 38, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Printezis, et al. (hereinafter “Printezis”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0000821 to Kolodner, et al. (hereinafter “Kolodner”).

Claims 8 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 20, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 20. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 38 and 40 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 44, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claims 20 and 44. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 38 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 11, 39, and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Printezis, et al. (hereinafter “Printezis”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0000821 to Kolodner, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,113 to Johnson, et al. (hereinafter “Johnson”).

Claims 9 and 11 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 20, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 20. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 39 and 41 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 44, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable in view of the discussion above with regard to claim 20. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that consideration of the above remarks renders the present application in condition for allowance, which action Applicant respectfully solicits.

Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Suzanne Erez/
Suzanne Erez
Reg. No. 46,688
Phone No. (972) 4-829-6069

Date: 15 May 2007
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598